UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,366	02/12/2004	Jean-Claude Girard	DN2003217	5090
27280 THE GOODYI	7590 02/09/200 EAR TIRE & RUBBER	EXAMINER		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 823			KNABLE, GEOFFREY L	
==	1144 EAST MARKET STREET AKRON, OH 44316-0001			PAPER NUMBER
			1733	-
				
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	NTHS	02/09/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

. •		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/777,366	GIRARD ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Geoffrey L. Knable	1733				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for		(IS SET TO EVDIDE 2 MONTH!	S) OD THIDTY (30) DAVS				
WHICH - Extension after SIX - If NO per - Failure to Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY EVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAY (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Beriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, by received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠ R	esponsive to communication(s) filed on 20 No	ovember 2006.					
2a)⊠ T	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3)□ S	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
cl	osed in accordance with the practice under E.	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition	n of Claims		•				
4)⊠ C	laim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application.						
, 4a	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)□ C	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
•	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>9-13</u> is/are rejected.						
·	laim(s) is/are objected to.	L. C. Santanak					
8)∐ C	laim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application	n Papers						
9)[] Th	ne specification is objected to by the Examiner	•					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)[] Tr	ne oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form P10-152.				
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119						
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).				
1.	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3.	Copies of the certified copies of the prior		ed in this National Stage				
	application from the International Bureau						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s	•						
	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Informa	tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) lo(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1733

- 1. Applicant's election of Group III, claims 9-13, in the reply filed on 11-20-2006 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
- 2. Claims 1-8 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 11-20-2006 as noted above.
- 3. Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

With removal from the claims of the reference to the antenna assembly being "annular", the invention is now defined in a manner which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention, i.e. it is considered to introduce new matter. In particular, there is no indication, either explicitly or implicitly, in the original disclosure that any antenna assembly (or recess) shape other than annular was contemplated as part of the invention. As such, the new more generic reference to an "antenna", without referring to it as "annular", is not considered to be supported by the original disclosure.

Art Unit: 1733

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fritze (US 3,662,335).

Fritze is applied for the same reasons as set forth in the last office action. As to the new language in the claims, the antenna assembly in the tire of Fritze clearly includes inward and outward boundaries, one bonded to the tire inner surface and one unbonded and facing the tire interior - note fig. 2. Note again that this is considered to satisfy the present claims, it being emphasized that these claims are directed to a tire not a process for producing a tire. In other words, the structural features of the tire required by these claims is considered to be clearly met by Fritze.

6. Applicant's arguments filed 11-20-2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The previous 35 USC 112 rejection has however been withdrawn in view of the response.

The arguments that the Fritze tire is not formed in the claimed manner are noted but again the claims are directed to a *tire* not a process for producing a tire and thus at issue is what structural tire requirements are required by the noted claims, it not being considered that there are any structural features of the tire claimed that are not shown by Fritze. Note again that Fritze discloses a tire including an annular antenna assembly vulcanized to the inside of the tire and clearly projecting from the inside surface - note esp. fig. 2 and col. 3, lines 59-66 - the structural features of the tire required by these claims are considered to be clearly met by this structural configuration in Fritze.

Art Unit: 1733

Applicant's argument that the Fritze tire does not include an antenna assembly with one boundary bonded to the tire inner surface and the other facing the tire interior are not convincing. Such is clearly shown in fig. 2. The argument that in fig. 2, the antenna assembly is embedded within the sidewall is plainly incorrect in view of both fig. 2 as well as col. 3, lines 59-66. The arguments with respect to col. 4, lines 4-7 of Fritze are noted but unconvincing as these lines are clearly not discussing the fig.2 embodiment.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Geoffrey L. Knable whose telephone number is 571-272-1220. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

Art Unit: 1733

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on 571-272-1226. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Geoffrey L. Knable

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1733

G. Knable

February 6, 2007